

A Vector Bundle of Rank 2 on $\mathbb{P}_1 \times \mathbb{P}_3$

H. Lange

Introduction: It is well-known that the Horrocks–Mumford bundle $\mathcal{F}$ encodes a lot of very interesting geometric information. This is essentially the reason for the fact that much work has been done in order to find other rank-2 bundles on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. The only non-splitting vector bundles of rank 2 on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, known upto now, are twists of pullbacks of $\mathcal{F}$ by finite coverings $f : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. So it seems to be a natural question to consider, instead of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, other Fano 4-folds. It is the aim of this note to give an example of a rank-2 vector bundle on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and to show that it also admits very interesting geometric properties.

Consider $P = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and let p and q denote its projections onto $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$, respectively. There is a canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \text{Pic}(\mathbb{P})$, given by $(a, b) \mapsto \mathcal{O}_P(a, b) := p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(a) \otimes q^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(b)$. First note that it is easy to construct nonsplitting vector bundles of rank 2 on P : According to the Künneth formula and Serre duality

$$h^1(P, \mathcal{O}_P(a, b)) = -(a+1) \binom{b+3}{3} > 0$$

for all $a \leq -2$ and $b \geq 0$. Hence for any such pair (a, b) there is a rank-2 vector bundle $\mathcal{F}$ on P fitting into an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_P \longrightarrow \mathcal{F} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_P(-a, -b) \longrightarrow 0.$$

Comparing Chern classes it is easy to see that $\mathcal{F}$ is not a direct sum of line bundles on P . From a geometric point of view these vector bundles are not so interesting, for example they have no jumping lines.

One of the reasons for the geometric relevance of the Horrocks–Mumford bundle seems to be that it is related, via the Serre construction, to a nonregular surface in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. This suggests that a nonregular subcanonical locally complete intersection surface in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ might yield an interesting vector bundle.

In [L] the abelian surfaces in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ were classified. In fact there is a two-dimensional family of abelian surfaces admitting an embedding into $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and for every such surface X there are only finitely many embeddings $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Via the Serre construction every such embedding yields a vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ of rank 2 with

Chern classes $c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 2h_1 + 4h_3$ and $c_2(\mathcal{E}) = 8h_1h_3 + 6h_3^2$, where h_i denotes the pullback of the class of a hyperplane section on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$. It is easy to see that the bundle $\mathcal{E}$ cannot be derived from the Horrocks–Mumford bundle on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ by an elementary transformation. The aim of this note is to derive some geometric properties of the bundle $\mathcal{E}$ to P .

Section 1 recalls some properties of the embedding $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ from [L] and derives some additional facts needed subsequently. In Section 2 the group of symmetries of X in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ is computed. In Section 3 it is shown that $\mathcal{E}$ is a stable vector bundle with respect to (h_1, h_3) . Section 4 studies the restrictions $\mathcal{E}|_{\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}}$ as a family of vector bundles on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$. In Section 5 the degree of a rational pencil of quadrics, which can be associated to $\mathcal{E}$ in a natural way, is determined. In Section 6 the generic splitting types and the set of jumping lines of $\mathcal{E}$ are computed. Finally Section 7 contains a list of open problems.

I would like to thank Ch. Birkenhake and K. Hulek for some valuable discussions. In particular Proposition 5.4 is due to the latter one.

1 Abelian surfaces in $\mathbb{P}_1 \times \mathbb{P}_3$

It is shown in [L] that there is a two-parameter family of abelian surfaces admitting an embedding into $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$. Moreover, it is proven that every abelian surface in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ is a member of this family. Suppose $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3) : X \hookrightarrow P := \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ is such an embedding of an abelian surface X over the field of complex numbers. In this section we recall some of its properties from [L] and derive some additional facts, which are needed subsequently.

Let h_i denote the pullback of the hyperplane section class of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}}$ to P for $i = 1$ and 3.

(1) the class $[X]$ of X in $H^4(P, \mathbb{Z})$ is

$$[X] = 8h_1h_3 + 6h_3^2.$$

(2) There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & E & \rightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{q} & F \rightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \varphi_1 \searrow & & \downarrow \overline{\varphi}_1 \\ & & & & & & \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{I}} \end{array}$$

where the row is an exact sequence of abelian varieties with elliptic curves E and F and $\overline{\varphi}_1$ is a double covering.

(3) Let L_i denote the line bundle on X defining the morphism $\varphi_i : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Then φ_i is given by the complete linear system $|L_i|$.

(4) The line bundle L_3 is of type $(1, 4)$ on X and $\varphi_3 : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ is a birational morphism onto a singular octic in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

(5) For every $t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ consider the scheme theoretical intersection $X_t := X \cap \{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ as a curve in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, i.e.

$$X_t = \varphi_3(\varphi_1^{-1}(t)).$$

Let $t_1, \dots, t_4$ denote the 4 ramification points of the double covering $\overline{\varphi_1} : F \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

Lemma 1.1. (i) For every $t \neq t_1, \dots, t_4$ the curve X_t is a disjoint union of 2 smooth plane cubics E_t and E'_t in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ both isomorphic to E .
(ii) For $\nu = 1, \dots, 4$ the curve X_{t_ν} is a double curve in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, not lying in a plane, with support a plane cubic E_{t_ν} isomorphic to E .

Proof. (i) This follows from (2) and (3), since $\varphi : X \hookrightarrow P$ embeds the curve X_t into $\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$.

(ii) The assertion about the support follows again from (2) and (3). That X_{t_ν} is a double curve follows from (2) and the fact that t_ν is a ramification point of the double covering $\overline{\varphi_1}$. It is only to show that the linear system $|L_3||X_{t_\nu}|$ is of dimension 3.

Since $\dim|L_3| = 3$, we have obviously $\dim(|L_3||X_{t_\nu}|) \leq 3$. For the converse inequality consider X as a family of curves $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}}$ over $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. Since $\dim(|L_3||X_t|) = 3$ for a general $t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$, the assertion follows by semicontinuity. $\square$

(6) For every point $x \in F$ let $P_{2,x}$ denote the plane in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ spanned by the plane cubic $\varphi_3(q^{-1}(x))$ ($= E_t$ or E'_t if $t = \overline{\varphi_3}(x)$).

Lemma 1.2. $P_{2,x} \neq P_{2,y}$ for all $x, y \in F, x \neq y$.

Proof. Suppose $P_{2,x} = P_{2,y}$. Let $D \in |L_3|$ denote the divisor corresponding to the plane $P_{2,x} = P_{2,y}$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$. then

$$D = q^{-1}(x) + q^{-1}(y) + \tilde{D}$$

with elliptic curves $q^{-1}(x)$ and $q^{-1}(y)$ and a curve $\tilde{D}$. It follows

$$8 = D^2 = D \cdot q^{-1}(x) + D \cdot q^{-1}(y) + D \cdot \tilde{D} = 6 + D \cdot \tilde{D}$$

and hence

$$2 = D \cdot \tilde{D} = q^{-1}(x)\tilde{D} + q^{-1}(y)\tilde{D} + \tilde{D}^2.$$

Since all summands on the right hand side are nonnegative, one of the summands must be 0. But then $\tilde{D}$ is a disjoint union of translates of E and all summands are

0, a contradiction. $\square$

(7) Let $x' \in F$ denote the conjugate of $x \in F$ with respect to the double covering $\overline{\varphi_1}$. Then, denoting $t = \overline{\varphi_1}(x)$,

$$Q_t := P_{2,x} + P_{2,x'}$$

is a quadric in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$, of rank 2 for all $t \neq t_1, \dots, t_4$ and of rank 1 for $t = t_\nu$. Consider the pencil $\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ of these quadrics.

Lemma 1.3. *$\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ is a rational pencil of quadrics of rank ≤ 2 and degree $d \geq 2$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$, i.e. of the form $\{\lambda^d Q_0 + \lambda^{d-1} Q_1 + \dots + \mu^d Q_d | (\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ with quadrics $Q_0, \dots, Q_d$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ is a linear pencil and let Q and Q' denote 2 different quadrics of rank 2 in it. We may choose the coordinates of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ such that Q is

given by the matrix $\text{diag}(1, 1, 0, 0)$. Then Q' is given by a matrix $\begin{pmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & 0 & 0 \\ a_1 & a_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$,

since all quadrics Q_t are of rank ≤ 2 . Then the linear system is given by the matrices

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a_0 + \mu & \lambda a_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \lambda a_1 & \lambda a_2 + \mu & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \middle| i(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \right\}.$$

Since $\det \begin{pmatrix} \lambda a_0 + \mu & \lambda a_1 \\ \lambda a_1 & \lambda a_2 + \mu \end{pmatrix} = 0$ has only 2 solutions, the pencil admits only 2 quadrics of rank 1, a contradiction. $\square$

For a quadric Q_t of rank 2 in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ let ℓ_t denote the singular line of Q_t .

Lemma 1.4. *The lines $\ell_t, t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ form a one-dimensional family of lines in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$.*

Proof. If this is not the case, then all quadrics of the pencil contain the same singular line ℓ and the pencil $\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ is given by a curve q of degree $d \geq 2$ in the plane π parametrizing the quadrics in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ with singular line ℓ . On the other hand the quadrics in π containing a fixed plane in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ form a line in π . This line intersects q in $d \geq 2$ points, which contradicts Lemma 1.2. $\square$

We will see later (see Proposition 5.3) that the pencil $\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ is of degree 4.

2 Symmetries of X in $\mathbf{P}_1 \times \mathbf{P}_3$.

Let $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3) : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ be an embedding of an abelian surface X defined by line bundles L_1 and L_3 on X as in Section 1. In this section we want to determine

the group of all translations of X which extend to elements of $PGL_1(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{PGL}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{C})$.

Recall that for any line bundle L on X the subgroup of all $x \in X$ with $t_x^*L \simeq L$ is denoted by $K(L)$. Here $t_x : X \rightarrow X$ denotes the translation of the abelian variety X by x . If L is base point free with corresponding morphism $\varphi_L : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\geq}$, then $K(L)$ is the largest subgroup of translations of X which are induced by automorphisms of $\mathbb{P}_{\geq}$. If L' is a second base point free line bundle on X with corresponding morphism $\varphi_{L'} : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$, let $K(L, L')$ denote the subgroup of all translations of X which are induced by elements of $PGL_m(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{PGL}_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathbb{C})$. Clearly such an element induces a translation t_x on X if and only if $x \in K(L) \cap K(L')$.

Let X_2 denotes the subgroup of 2-division points of X . Then we have

Proposition 2.1. $K(L_1, L_3) = K(L_3) \cap X_2$.

Proof. By construction of $\varphi_1 : X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ there is a line bundle ℓ_1 on the elliptic curve F such that $L_1 = q^*\ell_1$ with $q : X \rightarrow F$ as in (2). We have $K(\ell_1) = F_2$, since ℓ_1 is of degree 2 on F . Hence $K(L_1) = q^*K(\ell_1)$ contains X_2 , and thus

$$K(L_3) \cap X_2 \subseteq K(L_3) \cap K(L_1) = K(L_1, L_3).$$

L_3 being of type $(1, 4)$ implies $K(L_3) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/\not\equiv \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/\not\equiv \mathbb{Z}$. Hence it suffices to show that no element of order 4 in $K(L_3)$ is contained in $K(L_1)$. Suppose $x \in K(L_1) \cap K(L_3)$ is of order 4. Then $t_x^*(L_1 \otimes L_3) \simeq t_x^*L_1 \otimes t_x^*L_3 \simeq L_1 \otimes L_3$, i.e. $x \in K(L_1 \otimes L_3)$. But

$$(L_1 \otimes L_3)^2 = 2(L_1 \cdot L_3) + (L_3^2) = 20$$

since $(L_1 \cdot L_3) = 6$ (see [L], Lemma 1.1). Hence $L_1 \otimes L_3$ is of type $(1, 10)$ and $K(L_1 \otimes L_3) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/\not\equiv \mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathbb{Z}/\not\equiv \mathbb{Z}$. Hence $K(L_1 \otimes L_3)$ does not contain an element of order 4. $\square$

Since L_3 is of type $(1, 4)$, Proposition 2.1 implies

$$K(L_1, L_3) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/\not\equiv \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/\not\equiv \mathbb{Z}$$

and one may choose coordinates of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ in such a way (see [CAV], p. 169) that generators σ and τ of $K(L_1, L_3)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in GL_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{GL}_{\not\equiv}(\mathbb{C}) \\ \tau &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right) \in GL_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{GL}_{\not\equiv}(\mathbb{C}). \end{aligned}$$

The *Heisenberg group of the pair* (L_1, L_3) is by definition the subgroup $H(L_1, L_3)$ of $GL_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{GL}_{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{C})$ generated by σ and τ . The Heisenberg group $H(L_1, L_3)$ acts in the usual way on the pair of line bundles (L_1, L_3) .

Proposition 2.2. *The Heisenberg group $H(L_1, L_3)$ is the dihedral group D_8 with 8 elements. It fits into an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \mu_2 \rightarrow H(L_1, L_3) \rightarrow K(L_1, L_3) \rightarrow 0$$

where μ_2 denotes the group of order 2 generated by the commutator $\sigma\tau\sigma^{-1}\tau^{-1}$.

Proof: $H_1(L_1, L_2)$ is generated by τ and the element $\kappa := \sigma\tau$ of order 4 with relation $\tau\kappa\tau = \kappa^{-1}$. $\square$

3 The vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathbf{P}_1 \times \mathbf{P}_3$

Let $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3) : X \rightarrow P = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{P}}$ be an embedding as in Section 1. Denote $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_P(2, 4)$. Then $\mathcal{L} = \omega_P^{-1}$ and there is an isomorphism

$$\xi : \mathcal{L} \otimes \omega_P \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \omega_X = \mathcal{O}_X.$$

According to the Serre-construction (which applies in this case, see [H], Remark 1.1.1) the pair (X, ξ) determines uniquely a triplet $(\mathcal{E}, s, \psi)$ with a rank-2 vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on P , a section $s \in H^0(P, \mathcal{E})$ such that $(s) = X$ and an isomorphism $\psi : \bigwedge^2 \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$.

The Koszul complex of the section s is

$$0 \rightarrow \bigwedge^2 \mathcal{E}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{E}^* \xrightarrow{s} I_X \rightarrow 0$$

where I_X denotes the ideal sheaf of X in P . Tensoring with $\bigwedge^2 \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_P(2, 4)$ and using $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^*(\bigwedge^2 \mathcal{E})$ we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_P \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{E} \rightarrow I_X(2, 4) \rightarrow 0. \quad (1)$$

Then we have, using Section 1 (1)

$$c_1(\mathcal{E}) = 2h_1 + 4h_3 \quad (2)$$

and

$$c_2(\mathcal{E}) = 8h_1h_3 + 6h_3^2. \quad (3)$$

Consider the ample line bundle $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{O}_P(1, 1)$ on P . A vector bundle $\mathcal{F}$ of rank 2 on P is called (*semi-*) *stable with respect to* $\mathcal{H}$ if for every invertible subsheaf $\mathcal{L}$ of $\mathcal{F}$

$$\mathcal{L} \cdot \mathcal{H}^3 \stackrel{<}{=} \frac{1}{2} \det \mathcal{F} \cdot \mathcal{H}^3.$$

Proposition 3.1. $\mathcal{E}$ is stable with respect to $\mathcal{H}$.

For the proof we need the following Lemma

Lemma 3.2. (i) Suppose $h^0(I_X(a, b)) \neq 0$ for some integers a and b . Then $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 2$.

(ii) $h^0(I_X(0, b)) \neq 0$ if and only if $b \geq 8$.

(iii) $h^0(I_X(a, 2)) = 0$ for $a \leq 2$.

Proof. (i) Since $h^0(\mathcal{O}_P(a, b)) = 0$ if $a < 0$, it suffices to show that $b \geq 2$. For a general $t \in \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}$ the intersection $X_t = X \cap \{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}$ is a disjoint union of 2 plane cubics in $\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}$ (see Section 1 (5)). In particular $h^0(\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}, \mathbb{I}_{X_t}(\mathbb{K})) = \mathbb{K}$. So the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_X(a, 1) \rightarrow I_{X_t}(1) \rightarrow I_{X_t}(1)/I_X(a, 1) \rightarrow 0$$

implies $h^0(I_X(a, 1)) = 0$ for all a .

(ii): $h^0(I_X(0, b)) \neq 0$ means that $X \subset \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{V}$ where V_b is a surface of degree b in $\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}$. Now that the composed map $\varphi_3 : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}$ is birational onto a (singular) octic in $\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}$ (see Section 1(4)). This implies the assertion.

(iii): It suffices to show $h^0(I_X(2, 2)) = 0$. But $h^0(I_X(2, 2)) \neq 0$ would mean (using the results of Section 4) that the pencil $\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_\mathbb{K}\}$ of Section 1 (7) is quadratic, contradicting Proposition 5.3 below. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Suppose $\mathcal{E}$ is not stable with respect to $\mathcal{H}$ and let $\mathcal{O}_P(a, b)$ be a subinvertible sheaf of $\mathcal{E}$ violating the stability of $\mathcal{E}$, i.e.

$$a + 3b = \mathcal{O}_P(a, b) \cdot \mathcal{H}^3 \geq \frac{1}{2} \det \mathcal{E} \cdot \mathcal{H}^3 = 7.$$

Then the composed map

$$\mathcal{O}_P(a, b) \rightarrow \mathcal{E} \rightarrow I_X(2, 4)$$

is nonzero, implying

$$h^0(I_X(2 - a, 4 - b)) \neq 0.$$

Lemma 3.2 implies that either $a \leq 1$ and $b \leq 2$ and $a \leq -1$ if $b = 2$ or $a = 2$ and $b \leq -4$. But in the first case $7 \leq a + 3b \leq 5$ and in the second case $7 \leq a + 3b \leq -10$, a contradiction. $\square$

Remark 3.3. The line bundle $\mathcal{O}_P(m, n)$ is ample if and only if $m > 0$ and $n > 0$. Defining the (semi-) stability of a rank-2 vector bundle on P with respect to $\mathcal{O}_P(m, n)$ in the same way as for $\mathcal{H}$. Then an analogous proof yields that $\mathcal{E}$ is

stable (respectively semistable) with respect to $\mathcal{O}_P(m, n)$ if and only if $n < 18m$ (respectively $n \leq 18m$).

In order to lift the action of the Heisenberg group $H(L_1, L_3)$ of the pair (L_1, L_3) to the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$, we need the cohomology of $\mathcal{E}(-2, -4)$.

Lemma 3.4

$$h^i(\mathcal{E}(-2, -4)) = \begin{cases} 0 & i \neq 2 \\ 2 & i = 2 \end{cases} \text{ for } i = 2.$$

Proof: Serre duality says $h^{4-i}(\mathcal{E}(-2, -4)) = h^i(\mathcal{E}(-2, -4))$. Hence it suffices to compute $h^i(\mathcal{E}(-2, -4))$ for $i \leq 2$. The exact sequence (1) yields

$$h^i(\mathcal{E}(-2, -4)) = h^i(I_X)$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$. Now the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow I_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_P \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0$ implies the assertion. $\square$

Proposition 3.5: *The vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ admits an action of the Heisenberg group $H(L_1, L_3)$ uniquely determined upto a constant by the embedding $X \hookrightarrow P$.*

Proof: An element $\mu \in H(L_1, L_3)$ may be considered as an automorphism of P . Moreover μ defines an isomorphism $\varphi_\mu : I_X(2, 4) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mu^* I_X(2, 4)$. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_P & \xrightarrow{s} & \mathcal{E} & \rightarrow & I_X(2, 4) \rightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & & & \downarrow \varphi_\mu \\ 0 & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_P & \rightarrow & \mu^* \mathcal{E} & \rightarrow & \mu^* I_X(2, 4) \rightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

It induces an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mu^* \mathcal{E}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{E}, \mu^* I_X(2, 4)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_P)$$

But $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_P) = H^1(\mathcal{E}^*) = H^1(\mathcal{E}(-2, -4)) = 0$ according to Lemma 3.4. This implies the assertion, the uniqueness coming from the fact that the embedding $X \hookrightarrow P$ determines the section s upto a constant. $\square$

4 Restriction to $\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_3$.

For any point $t \in \mathbb{P}_\mu$ consider the restriction

$$\mathcal{E}_t := \mathcal{E}|_{\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu}$$

as a rank-2 vector bundle on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$. X_t is a local complete intersection curve in $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ and the triplet $(\mathcal{E}_t, s|_{\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu}, \psi|_{\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu})$ corresponds to the pair $(X_t, \xi|_{\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu})$

via the Serre-construction. Hence we get the following exact sequence directly by restricting (1) of Section 2.

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}} \xrightarrow{s_t} \mathcal{E}_t \rightarrow I_{X_t}(4) \rightarrow 0. \quad (1)$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(\mathcal{E}_t) &= 4 \\ c_2(\mathcal{E}_t) &= 6 \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4.1 *For any $t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}_t$ is semistable but not stable.*

Proof. The quadric Q_t of Lemma 1.3 contains the curve X_t and is in fact the only quadric in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ containing X_t . Hence $h^0(I_{X_t}(2)) = 1$ and the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(-2) \rightarrow E_t(-2) \rightarrow I_{X_t}(2) \rightarrow 0$ implies $h^0(E_t(-2)) = 1$. This means that E_t is not stable. On the other hand $h^0(E_t(-3)) = 0$ means that E_t is semistable. $\square$

Let $\sigma_t \in H^0(E_t(-2))$ denote the non-zero section, uniquely determined upto a constant, and $Y_t = (\sigma_t)$ the corresponding zero variety in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Then we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}} \xrightarrow{\sigma_t} \mathcal{E}_t(-2) \rightarrow I_{Y_t} \rightarrow 0. \quad (2)$$

Lemma 4.2. *Y_t is a curve of degree 2 in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ with $p_a(Y) = -3$ and $\omega_{Y_t} = \mathcal{O}_{Y_t}(-4)$.*

Proof. According to [H], Proposition 2.1 we have $\deg Y = c_2(E(-2)) = 2$ and $2p_a(Y) - 2 = c_2(E(-2)) \cdot (c_1(E(-2)) - 4) = -8$, i.e. $p_a(Y) = -3$. The assertion for ω_{Y_t} follows from the adjunction formula. $\square$

Let Z_t denote the reduced curve underlying Y_t .

Lemma 4.3 (i): *Z_t is a line in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ and Y_t is a multiplicity 2 structure on Z_t .*
(ii): *Choose the coordinates x_i , $i = 0, \dots, 3$ of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ in such a way that Z_t is the line $x_0 = x_1 = 0$. then Y_t is given by the homogeneous ideal*

$$(x_0^2, x_0x_1, x_1^2, f \cdot x_0 + g \cdot x_1)$$

where f and g are forms of degree 3 in x_2 and x_3 without common zero.

Proof. (i): Since $\deg Y_t = 2$, it suffices to show that Y_t is irreducible. But otherwise Y_t would be reduced and hence $p_a(Y) \geq -1$.

(ii): According to Ferrand's theorem (see [H], Theorem 1.5 with $m = 4$) there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_{Y_t} \rightarrow I_{Z_t} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Z_t}(2) \rightarrow 0.$$

Consider the conormal bundle sequence $0 \rightarrow N_{Y_t|\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}^*|_{Z_t} \rightarrow N_{Z_t|\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}^* \rightarrow N_{Z_t|Y_t}^* \rightarrow 0$. According to (i) $N_{Z_t|\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}^* = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(1)^{\oplus 2}$. Hence we get an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_{Y_t}|\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(\mathbb{K})^{\oplus 2} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(\mathbb{K}) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}.$$

The map u is given by 2 forms f and g of degree 3 on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ without common zeros. This implies that $I_{Y_t}|\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is generated by $fx_0 + gx_1$. $\square$

Suppose $t \neq t_\nu$ for $\nu = 1, \dots, 4$. Then X_t consists of 2 disjoint plane cubics E_t and E'_t . Denote by P_t and P'_t the planes spanned by E_t and E'_t . Then we have

Proposition 4.4. *The line Z_t is the line of intersection $P_t \cap P'_t$ and the cubic forms f and g are given by $E_t \cap Z_t$ and $E'_t \cap Z_t$.*

Proof. Restricting the exact sequence (1) to the plane P_t we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{P_t}(3) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_t|_{P_t} \rightarrow I_{E'_t \cap P_t}(1) \rightarrow 0. \quad (3)$$

since P_t contains the plane cubic E_t . Computing the generic splitting type of $\mathcal{E}_t|_{P_t}$ using (2), we see that P_t contains the line Z_t (but not the double curve Y_t). Similarly P'_t contains Z_t , i.e. $P_t \cap P'_t = Z_t$. Restricting (2) to P_t and comparing it with (3) gives the assertion for the forms f and g . $\square$

5 The Double Structure and the Pencil of Quadrics

The quadrics of the rational pencil $\{Q_t|t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ of Section 1 fill up a 3-fold $Q \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ containing X . According to Lemma 1.3 $\{Q_t|t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ is a rational pencil of degree $d \geq 2$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Hence Q is a hypersurface of bidegree $(d, 2)$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Obviously Q is the only hypersurface of bidegree $(d, 2)$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ containing X . This means

$$h^0(I_X(d, 2)) = 1.$$

From the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}}(d-2, -2) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(d-2, -2) \rightarrow I_X(d, 2) \rightarrow 0$ we deduce

$$h^0(\mathcal{E}(d-2, -2)) = 1.$$

Hence there is an exact sequence, unique upto a multiplicative constant

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathcal{E}(d-2, -2) \rightarrow I_Y(2d-2, 0) \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

with a surface $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ of class

$$[Y] = 4h_1h_3 + 2h_3^2.$$

For every point $t \in \mathbb{P}_\mu$ the exact sequence (1) restricts to the exact sequence (2) of Section 4. Hence for every $t \in \mathbb{P}_\mu$ the surface $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ restricts to the curve $Y_t \subseteq \{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$. According to Lemma 4.3 Y_t is a double structure on a line Z_t in $\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ for all t . This implies

Proposition 5.1. *The surface $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ is a double structure on a $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ -bundle $Z \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ over $\mathbb{P}_\mu$. The bundle map $Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$ coincides with the projection onto the first factor of $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$. The class of Z in $H^4(\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu, \mathbb{Z})$ is $[Z] = 2h_1h_3 + h_3^2$.*

In other words Z is a certain Hirzebruch surface Σ embedded into $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ with class $2h_1h_3 + h_3^2$ such that the bundle map $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$ coincides with the projection onto the first factor. The following lemma classifies these embeddings.

Let Σ_e denote the Hirzebruch surface with invariant $e \geq 0$. There is a section C_0 of $p : \Sigma_e \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$ such that

$$\text{Pic}(\Sigma_e) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{C}_\mu] + \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{U}]$$

where f denotes a fibre of p , with intersection numbers

$$C_0^2 = -e \quad , \quad C_0 \cdot f = 1 \quad , \quad f^2 = 0.$$

Suppose $i = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3) : \Sigma_e \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ is an embedding such that

$$(i) \quad [\Sigma_e] = 2h_1h_3 + h_3^2 \text{ in } H^4(\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu, \mathbb{Z})$$

$$(ii) \quad \varphi_1 : \Sigma_e \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu \text{ is given by the linear system } |\mathbb{U}|.$$

Then we have

Lemma 5.2. *Either $e = 0$ and φ_3 is given by the linear system $|C_0 + f|$ or $e = 2$ and φ_3 is given by the linear system $|C_0 + 2f|$. Conversely, in these cases $i = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3)$ is an embedding.*

Proof. As usual we identify classes in $H^i(\Sigma_e, \mathbb{Z})$ with their images in $H^i(\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu, \mathbb{Z})$. Condition (ii) means $[\Sigma_e] \cdot h_1 = f$ which implies

$$f \cdot h_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad f \cdot h_3 = 1. \quad (2)$$

Let $\varphi_3 : \Sigma_e \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$ be given by a sublinear system of $|\alpha C_0 + \beta f|$. Necessarily $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\beta \geq 0$.

$$2h_1h_3^2 + h_3^3 = [\Sigma_3] \cdot h_3 = \alpha C_0 + \beta f. \quad (3)$$

Using (2) this implies

$$\alpha C_0 \cdot h_1 = 1$$

and

$$\alpha C_0 \cdot h_3 = 2 - \beta.$$

This implies

$$C_0 \cdot h_1 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = 1.$$

Hence

$$\beta \leq 2.$$

On the other hand

$$2 = [\Sigma_e] \cdot h_3^2 = (h_3|_{\Sigma_e})^2 = (C_0 + \beta f)^2 = -e + 2\beta$$

i.e.

$$\beta = \frac{e}{2} + 1.$$

We remain with the 2 cases $e = 0, \beta = 1$ and $e = 2, \beta = 2$.

Conversely assume that the surface and the linear systems are of one of the 2 cases. In the first case φ_3 embeds $\Sigma_0 = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ as a smooth quadric in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$. In the second case φ_3 embeds $\Sigma_2 - C_0$ and contracts C_0 to a quadric cone in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$. But then φ_1 is injective on C_0 and the differential of (φ_1, φ_3) has maximal rank. So in both cases $i = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3)$ is an embedding. $\square$

The surface Y is a double structure on Z with Z as in Lemma 6.2. Let $\mathcal{L}$ denote the ideal of Z in $\mathcal{O}_Y$. So we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z \rightarrow 0 \quad (4)$$

Note that $\mathcal{L}$ is a line bundle on X , since $\mathcal{L}/\mathcal{L}^2 = 0$. Using the Riemann–Roch Theorem for the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}(a, b)$, saying

$$\chi(\mathcal{E}(a, b)) = -6 + 12a + \frac{34}{3}b + 6b^2 + \frac{41}{3}ab + \frac{2}{3}b^3 + 4ab^2 + \frac{1}{3}ab^3 \quad (5)$$

for all $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ one can determine $\mathcal{L}$ and d :

Proposition 5.3. *Suppose $Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is a double structure on Z ($\simeq \Sigma_e, e = 0$ or 2) defined by the line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on Z . Then*

$$(a) \quad \mathcal{L} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_Z(2C_0 - 2f) & e = 0 \\ \mathcal{O}_Z(2C_0) & e = 2 \end{cases} \quad \text{if}$$

(b) *The pencil of quadrics $\{Q_t | t \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}\}$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{K}}$ is of degree 4.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_Z(xC_0 + yf)$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\mathcal{O}_Z \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}}(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_Z(\beta C_0 + (\alpha + \beta)f) & e = 0 \\ \mathcal{O}_Z(\beta C_0 + (\alpha + 2\beta)f) & e = 2 \end{cases} \quad \text{if}$$

and from (1) and (4) we get the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}}(a - d + 2, b + 2) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(a, b) \rightarrow I_Y(a + d, b + 2) \rightarrow 0 \quad (6)$$

$$0 \rightarrow I_Y(a + d, b + 2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}}(a + d, b + 2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(a + d, b + 2) \rightarrow 0 \quad (7)$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z((x+b+2)C_0 + (y+a+b+d+2)f) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(a+d, b+2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+b+d+2)f) \rightarrow 0 \quad (8)$$

if $e = 0$ and

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z((x+b+2)C_0 + (y+a+2b+d+4)f) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Y(a+d, b+2) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+2b+d+4)f) \rightarrow 0 \quad (9)$$

if $e = 2$. Using Riemann–Roch for line bundles on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}$ and Z , equations (6) – (9) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(\mathcal{E}(a, b)) &= \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}}(a - d + 2, b + 2)) + \chi(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1} \times \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{A}^1}}(a + d, b + 2)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_Y(a + d, b + 2)) \\ &= (a - d + 3) \binom{b+5}{3} + (a + d + 1) \binom{b+5}{3} - \\ &\quad \begin{cases} -\chi(\mathcal{O}_Z((x+b+2)C_0 + (y+a+b+d+2)f)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+b+d+2)f)) & \text{if } e=0 \\ -\chi(\mathcal{O}_Z((x+b+2)C_0 + (y+a+2b+d+4)f)) - \chi(\mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+2b+d+4)f)) & \text{if } e=2 \end{cases} \\ &= (2a+4) \binom{b+5}{3} + \begin{cases} -(x+b+3)(y+a+b+d+3) - (b+3)(a+b+d+3) & \text{if } e=0 \\ -(x+b+3)(y-x+a+b+d+3) - (b+3)(a+b+d+3) & \text{if } e=2. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this with (5) we obtain

$$(x - 2)a + (x + y + 2d - 8)b + (y + d + 3)(x + 3) + 3d - 37 = 0 \quad \text{if } e = 0$$

and

$$(x - 2)a + (y + 2d - 8)b + (y - x + d + 3)(x + 3) + 3d - 37 = 0 \quad \text{if } e = 2$$

as polynomials in a and b .

Hence if $e = 0 : x = 2, y = 6 - 2d$ and $2d - 8 = 0$ and if $e = 2 : x = 2, y = 8 - 2d$ and $2d - 8 = 0$. $\square$

K. Hulek gave a different proof of Proposition 5.3 using the normal bundle sequence of $Z \subseteq Y \subseteq P$. The following proposition saying that the case $Z = \Sigma_2$ does not occur in our situation is also due to him.

Proposition 5.4. (Hulek): *Suppose $Z(= \Sigma_e)$ embedded in $P = \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ as above admits a double structure Y in P , then $e = 0$.*

Proof: Suppose $Z = \Sigma_2 \subset P$ admits a double structure $Y \subseteq P$. According to Lemma 5.2 the morphism $\varphi_3|_Z : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$ is the contraction of the curve C_0 with image a quadric in $\mathbb{P}_\mu$. Hence C_0 considered as a curve in P is the preimage of a point in $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ under the natural projection $P = \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$. This yields

$$N_{C_0|P} = \mathcal{O}_{C_0}^{\oplus 3}.$$

Since $N_{C_0|Z} = \mathcal{O}_{C_0}(-2)$, the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N_{C_0|Z} \rightarrow N_{C_0|P} \rightarrow N_{Z|P}|_{C_0} \rightarrow 0$ implies that there are 2 possibilities for $N_{Z|P}|_{C_0}$, namely

$$N_{Z|P}|_{C_0} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}_{C_0} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{C_0}(2) \\ \mathcal{O}_{C_0}(1)^{\oplus 2} \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad (10)$$

On the other hand the line bundle $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$ on Z of Proposition 5.3 may be considered as the normal bundle of Z in Y . The exact sequence of normal bundles for $Z \subseteq Y \subseteq P$ shows that $\mathcal{L}^{-1}$ is a subbundle of $N_{Z|P}$.

But

$$\mathcal{L}^{-1}|_{C_0} = \mathcal{O}_Z(-2C_0)|_{C_0} = \mathcal{O}_{C_0}(4)$$

which cannot be a subbundle of $N_{Z|P}|_{C_0}$ according to (10). $\square$

So for the rest of the paper we may assume that Y is a double structure on $Z = \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$, embedded in P as in Lemma 5.2. For the computation of the cohomology of $\mathcal{E}$ it will be important to know for which pairs (a, b) the scheme Y is (a, b) -normal in P .

Recall that a closed subscheme $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ is called (a, b) -normal for some non-negative integers a and b if the canonical map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu}(a, b)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_V(a, b))$ is surjective. Note first

Lemma 5.5 *Let $i = (\varphi_1, \varphi_3) : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ be the embedding of Lemma 5.2. Then Z is (a, b) -normal in $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ for all $(a, b) \geq 0$.*

Proof. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu}(a, b)) & \xrightarrow{(\varphi_1, \varphi_3)^*} & H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(a, b)) \\ (\varphi_1 \times \varphi_3)^* \searrow & & \nearrow \Delta^* \\ & H^0(Z \times Z, \varphi_1^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(a) \otimes \varphi_3^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(b)) & \end{array}$$

where $\Delta : Z \rightarrow Z \times Z$ denotes the diagonal map. It suffices to show that for all $a, b \geq 0$:

(i) $(\varphi_1 \times \varphi_3)^*$ is surjective

(ii) Δ^* is surjective.

(i): By Künneth $(\varphi_1 \times \varphi_3)^*$ identifies with

$$\varphi_1^* \otimes \varphi_3^* : H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(a)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(b)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(af)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(bC_0 + bf)).$$

But φ_1^* is an isomorphism and φ_3^* is surjective since φ_3 is the Veronese embedding $\varphi_3 : Z = \mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_k$, which is projectively normal.

(ii): Let $\mathbb{P}_k^i$ denote the i -th component of $Z = \mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$. According to Künneth the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(af)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(bC_0 + bf)) & \xrightarrow{\Delta^*} & H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(bC_0 + (a+b)f)) \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^1}(a)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^1}(b)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^2}(b)) & \longrightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^1}(a+b)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^2}(b)) \end{array}$$

But this is surjective, since the multiplication map $H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(a)) \otimes H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(b)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(a+b))$ is surjective for all $a, b \geq 0$. $\square$

Proposition 5.6. *In the case $e = 0$ the embedding $Y \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$ is (a, b) -normal for all $a \geq 0, b \geq 3$ or $(a, b) = (0, 1)$.*

Proof. Using (4) we have the following commutative diagram with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow & I_{Z|\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, b) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, b) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Z(a, b) & \rightarrow 0 \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & \\ 0 \rightarrow & \mathcal{L}(a, b) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Y(a, b) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_Z(a, b) & \rightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since Z is (a, b) -normal in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$, this yields

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow & H^0(I_{Z|\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, b)) & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, b)) & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(a, b)) & \rightarrow 0 \\ & \downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow & & \parallel & \\ 0 \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{L}(a, b)) & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a, b)) & \rightarrow & H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z(a, b)) & \rightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Hence it suffices to show that φ is surjective. But

$$\mathcal{L}(a, b) = \mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+b-2)f).$$

So φ is surjective if and only if the canonical map

$$H^0(N_{Z|\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}^*(bC_0 + (a+b)f)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+b-2)f))$$

is surjective, where $N_{Z|\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}^*$ denotes the conormal bundle of Z in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$. Now $\det N_{Z|\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}^* = \mathcal{O}_Z(-2C_0 - 4f)$ and the normal bundle sequence for $Z \subset Y \subset P$ gives

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z((b-4)C_0 + (a+b-2)f) \rightarrow N_{Z|\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}^*(bC_0 + (a+b)f) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_Z((b+2)C_0 + (a+b-2)f) \rightarrow 0.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} h^1(\mathcal{O}_Z(b-4)C_0 + (a+b-2)f) &= h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(b-4)) \cdot h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(a+b-2)) \\ &\quad + h^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(b-4)) \cdot h^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k}(a+b-2)) \\ &= 0 \quad \text{if } b \geq 3 \quad \text{or } (a, b) = (0, 1). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Remark 5.7 The proof of Proposition 5.6 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } b = 2, a \geq 0 : \quad & \text{codim}(H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, 2)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a, 2))) \leq a + 1 \\ \text{for } b = 1, a \geq 0 : \quad & \text{codim}(H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, 1)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a, 1))) \leq 2a \quad \text{and} \\ \text{for } b = 0, a \geq 1 : \quad & \text{codim}(H^0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k}(a, 0)) \rightarrow H^0(\mathcal{O}_Y(a, 0))) \leq 3(a - 1). \end{aligned}$$

6 Splitting type of $\mathcal{E}$

There are 2 types of lines in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$. In this section lines $\{t\} \times \ell$ (respectively $\mathbb{P}_k \times \{\curvearrowright\}$) are called *horizontal* (respectively *vertical*) *lines* in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$. Restriction of the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ to these lines leads to the notion of *horizontal* (respectively *vertical*) *generic splitting types* as well as *horizontal* (respectively *vertical*) *jumping lines*.

Proposition 6.1 (a) *The horizontal generic splitting type of $\mathcal{E}$ is $(2, 2)$.*
 (b) *The vertical generic splitting type of $\mathcal{E}$ is $(1, 1)$.*

Proof. (a) follows from the fact that $\mathcal{E}_t$ is semistable but not stable with $c_1(\mathcal{E}_t) = 4$ on $\mathbb{P}_k$ (see Section 4).

(b): According to Section 1(4) the projection $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_k$ is birational onto its image. Hence there is a vertical line $\ell = \mathbb{P}_k \times \{\curvearrowright\}$ intersecting X transversally in exactly one point. Restricting the exact sequence Section 2(1) to ℓ gives

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{E}|_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\ell/I_{\ell \cap A} \otimes \mathcal{O}_\ell(2) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence $\mathcal{E}|_\ell = \mathcal{O}_\ell(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\ell(1)$. $\square$

Proposition 6.2. (a) *The horizontal jumping lines of $\mathcal{E}$ are exactly the horizontal lines ℓ in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$ intersecting the surface $Z \subset \mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$ of Proposition 5.1.*

(b) If ℓ intersects Z transversally, then $\mathcal{E}|_\ell = \mathcal{O}_\ell(4) \oplus \mathcal{O}_\ell(0)$.

In particular all horizontal jumping lines are "higher" jumping lines.

Proof. Let $\ell = \{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ intersect the line Z_t in $\{t\} \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ transversally. Then ℓ intersects the double structure Y_t on Z_t with multiplicity 2. Restricting the exact sequence (2) of Section 4 to ℓ we get

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\ell \rightarrow E_t(-2)|_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\ell/I_{\ell \cap Y_t} \oplus \mathcal{O}_\ell \rightarrow 0$$

which fills up to an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\ell(2) \rightarrow E_t(-2)|_\ell \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\ell(-2) \rightarrow 0$$

which necessarily splits. This proves (b).

As for (a): Since $\mathcal{E}_t$ is semistable on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$, according to a theorem of Barth (see [O.S.S] p. 228) the jumping lines of $\mathcal{E}_t$ on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ form a divisor in the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(1, 3)$ and there is an effective divisor $D_{\mathcal{E}_t}$ of degree $c_2(\mathcal{E}_t(-2)) = 2$ with support the set of jumping lines $S_{\mathcal{E}_t}$ in $\text{Gr}(1, 3)$.

On the other hand: The hypersurface $H_{Z_t} = \{\ell \in \text{Gr}(1, 3) | \ell \cap Z_t = \emptyset\}$ consists of jumping lines. Since every such jumping line is "higher", we get $D_{E_t} = 2H_{Z_t}$. This implies the assertion. $\square$

Finally let us determine the vertical jumping lines of $\mathcal{E}$. In order to state the result recall from [L] that the coordinates of $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ can be chosen in such a way that the map $\varphi_3 : X \rightarrow \varphi_3(X) \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu$ is an embedding outside the coordinate planes, whereas $\varphi_3(X)$ is singular along the coordinate planes. Choosing the coordinates of $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ in this way, we have

Proposition 6.3. *The vertical jumping lines are exactly the lines $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \{\curvearrowright\}$ with x contained in a coordinate plane.*

(b) For a general vertical jumping line $\ell : \mathcal{E}|_\ell = \mathcal{O}_\ell(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_\ell(0)$.

For the proof let $S_{\mathcal{E}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu$ denote the set of jumping lines and consider the projection $q : \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$.

Lemma 6.4. $S_{\mathcal{E}} = \text{supp}(R_{q*}^1 \mathcal{E}(-2, -2))$.

Proof. Let $U \subset \mathbb{P}_\mu$ be open affine. For $x \in U$ denote $\ell = \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \{\curvearrowright\}$ and I_ℓ the ideal sheaf of ℓ . Then $H^2(\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{U}, \mathcal{E}(-\not\curvearrowright, -\not\curvearrowright) \otimes I_\ell) = \not\curvearrowright$, since $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{U}$ can be covered by 2 open affine sets. Hence the canonical map $H^1(\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{U}, \mathcal{E}(-\not\curvearrowright, -\not\curvearrowright)) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}^\not\curvearrowright(\ell, \mathcal{E}(-\not\curvearrowright, -\not\curvearrowright)|_\ell)$ is surjective. This implies that the base change homomorphism

$$R^1 q_* \mathcal{E}(-2, -2)(x) \rightarrow H^1(\ell, \mathcal{E}(-2, -2)|_\ell)$$

is an isomorphism. On the other hand $\ell = \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \{\curvearrowright\}$ is a vertical jumping line if and only if $h^1(\ell, \mathcal{E}(-2, -2)|_\ell) > 0$. $\square$

In order to define a scheme structure on $S_\mathcal{E}$ choose a resolution

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r+2} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu}(-a_i, -b_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}(-2, -2) \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

with $a_i, b_i > 0$ for all i and $\mathcal{K}$ is a locally free sheaf of rank r on $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$. The sequence

$$0 \rightarrow R_{q_*}^1 \mathcal{K} \xrightarrow{\varphi} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r+2} R_{q_*}^1 \mathcal{O}(-a_i, -b_i) \xrightarrow{\psi} R_{q_*}^1 \mathcal{E}(-2, -2) \rightarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

is exact: φ is injective since $q_* \mathcal{E}(-2, -2)$ is torsion free and 0 outside $S_\mathcal{E}$ and ψ is surjective since $R_{q_*}^2 \mathcal{K} = 0$.

The sheaves $R_{q_*}^1 \mathcal{K}$ and $R_{q_*}^1 \mathcal{O}(-a_i, -b_i)$ are locally free by the base change theorem since $h^1(\mathcal{O}_\ell(-a_i, -b_i))$ and $h^1(\mathcal{K}|_\ell) = -\chi(\mathcal{K}|_\ell)$ are independent of ℓ .

Hence φ is a homomorphism of locally free sheaves of the same rank on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ and

$$J_\varphi := \text{Im}(\det \varphi) \otimes \det \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{r+2} R_{q_*}^1 \mathcal{O}(-a_i, -b_i) \right)^* \subseteq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}$$

is an invertible ideal sheaf in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}$ with $\text{supp}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}/J_\varphi) = S_\mathcal{E}$. Hence $D_\mathcal{E} := (S_\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}/J_\varphi)$ is a divisor on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$.

Lemma 6.5. $\deg D_\mathcal{E} = 4$.

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}_\mu \subseteq \mathbb{P}_\mu$ be a general line. Since the divisor $D_\mathcal{E}$ intersects the line $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ in a divisor of the same degree, we may restrict the whole situation to $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ and compute the degree of the corresponding divisor on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$.

By abuse of notation we denote the restricted objects to $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ by the same letter. In particular we have the restricted sequences (1) on $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ and (2) on $\mathbb{P}_\mu$. If $h_1 = [p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(1)]$ and $h_2 = [q^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(1)]$, then from (1) we get

$$c_1(K) = - \sum_i (a_i h_1 + b_i h_2) + 2h_1 \quad (3)$$

$$c_2(K) = \sum_{i \neq j} a_i b_j - 4 - 2 \sum_i b_i \quad (4)$$

Applying flat base change and the projection formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned} R^1 q_* \mathcal{O}(-a_i, -b_i) &= R_{q_*}^1 p^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(-a_i) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(-b_i) \\ &= H^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(-a_i)) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_\mu}(-b_i) \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$c_i(R^1q_*\mathcal{O}(-a_i, -b_i)) = -b_i(a_i - 1).$$

The Theorem of Grothendieck–Riemann–Roch for the morphism $q : \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_\mu$ and equations (3) and (4) give

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(R^1q_*\mathcal{K}) &= -c_1(\mathcal{K})h_1 - \frac{1}{2}(c_1^2(\mathcal{K}) - 2c_2(\mathcal{K})) \\ &= -\sum_i a_i b_i + \sum_i b_i - 4 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg D_{\mathcal{E}} &= -c_1\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{r+2} R^1q_*\mathcal{O}(-a_i, -b_i)\right) - c_1(R^1q_*\mathcal{K}) \\ &= -\sum_i b_i(a_i - 1) + \sum_i a_i b_i - \sum_i b_i + 4 = 4 \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Proof of Proposition 6.3. Let $H_1, \dots, H_4$ denote the 4 coordinate planes in $\mathbb{P}_\mu$. For a general point x of $\varphi_3(X) \cap H_i$ the vertical line $\ell = \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \{\curvearrowright\}$ intersects $X \subset \mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ transversally in 2 points. Restriction of the exact sequence (1) of Section 2 to ℓ gives $\mathcal{E}|_\ell = \mathcal{O}_\ell(2) \oplus \mathcal{O}_\ell(2)$. Hence the divisor $\varphi_3(X) \cap H_i \subset D_{\mathcal{E}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$. Since $H_1 + \dots + H_4$ is the only divisor of degree ≤ 4 in $\mathbb{P}_\mu$ containing the 4 curves $\varphi_3(X) \cap H_i$, the assertion follows. $\square$

7 Problems

Of course concerning the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ on $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$ one can ask all the questions which have been studied for the Horrocks–Mumford bundle on $\mathbb{P}_\mu^5$. The most important problems are

(1) **Cohomology of $\mathcal{E}$:** Compute the dimensions of the groups $H^i(\mathcal{E}(a, b))$ for all a, b and i . I computed most of these groups, unfortunately the list is not complete. In particular the most important dimension $h^0(\mathcal{E})$ is not known.

(2) **Automorphisms of $\mathcal{E}$:** According to Proposition 3.5 the group of automorphisms of the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ contains the dihedral group $D_8 = H_1(L_1, L_3)$. Does $\mathcal{E}$ admit further automorphisms? Recall that the automorphism group of the Horrocks–Mumford bundle is the normalizer of the Heisenberg group in $S\ell_5(\mathbb{C})$. Is the analogue statement valid in the case of $\mathcal{E}$?

(3) **Moduli:** Describe the moduli spaces of vector bundles with the invariants of $\mathcal{E}$. This question is closely related to (1) and (2). For example, if $h^0(\mathcal{E}) \leq 2$, then $\mathcal{E}$ admits moduli, since there is a two-dimensional family of abelian surfaces in $\mathbb{P}_\mu \times \mathbb{P}_\mu$.

(4) **Other constructions:** It seems not too difficult to construct the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}$ out of the double structure Y on $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$ in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$ of Section 5. Are there other constructions?

(5) **Degenerations:** It is not difficult to see that every smooth zero set of a global section of $\mathcal{E}$ is an abelian surface A in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$. Determine the degenerations of A in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$. Is every such degeneration the zero set of a section of (one of the vector bundles) $\mathcal{E}$?

(6) **Classification:** Are there other rank-2 vector bundles on $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$ apart from the bundles derived from $\mathcal{E}$ or the bundles of the introduction?

Literature:

- [CAV] **H. Lange, Ch. Birkenhake:** *Complex Abelian Varieties*; Grundlehren 302, Springer 1992
- [H] **R. Hartshorne:** *Stable Vector Bundles of Rank 2 on $\mathbb{P}_k$* ; Math. Ann. 238 (1978), 229 -280
- [L] **H. Lange:** *Abelian surfaces in $\mathbb{P}_k \times \mathbb{P}_k$* . Arch. Math. 63 (1994), 80 – 84.
- [O.S.S] **Ch. Okonek, M. Schneider, H. Spindler:** *Vector Bundles on Complex Projective Spaces*; Progr. in Math. 3, Birkhäuser 1980